

1
2
3
4
5
6 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
7 **FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**
8

9 Ismael Villa,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 Express Truss & Framing Systems LLC, et
13 al.,

14 Defendants.

No. CV-24-01890-PHX-SMM (ASB)

ORDER

15 This matter was assigned to Magistrate Judge Alison S. Bachus. (Doc. 3). On July
16 24, 2025, the Magistrate Judge filed a Report and Recommendation with this Court.¹
17 (Doc. 33). The Magistrate Judge has recommended that Plaintiff's Motion for Attorney
18 Fees be granted in-part. To date, no objections have been filed.

19
20 ¹ This case is assigned to a Magistrate Judge. However, not all parties have
21 consented to the jurisdiction of the Magistrate Judge. Thus, the matter is before this Court
pursuant to General Order 21-25, which states in relevant part:

22 When a United States Magistrate Judge to whom a civil action has been
23 assigned pursuant to Local Rule 3.7(a)(1) considers dismissal to be
24 appropriate but lacks the jurisdiction to do so under 28 U.S.C. § 636(c)(1)
due to incomplete status of election by the parties to consent or not consent
to the full authority of the Magistrate Judge,

25 **IT IS ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge will prepare a Report and
Recommendation for the Chief United States District Judge or designee.

26 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** designating the following District Court
27 Judges to review and, if deemed suitable, to sign the order of dismissal on
my behalf:

28 Phoenix/Prescott: Senior United States District Judge Stephen M.
McNamee

STANDARD OF REVIEW

The Court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); see Baxter v. Sullivan, 923 F.2d 1391, 1394 (9th Cir. 1991). Parties have fourteen days from the service of a copy of the Magistrate’s recommendation within which to file specific written objections to the Court. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 6, 72. Failure to object to a Magistrate Judge’s recommendation relieves the Court of conducting *de novo* review of the Magistrate Judge’s factual findings and waives all objections to those findings on appeal. See Turner v. Duncan, 158 F.3d 449, 455 (9th Cir. 1998). A failure to object to a Magistrate Judge’s conclusion “is a factor to be weighed in considering the propriety of finding waiver of an issue on appeal.” Id.

DISCUSSION

Having reviewed the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, and no Objections having been made by any party thereto, the Court hereby incorporates and adopts the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, for the reasons set forth,

IT IS ORDERED adopting the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge. (Doc. 33).


IT IS FURTHER ORDERED granting in-part Plaintiff’s Motion for Attorneys’ Fees and Costs. (Doc. 31). Plaintiff is awarded \$3,555.00 in attorney fees and \$796.00 in costs, for a total of \$4,351.00, against Defendants Express Truss Framing Systems LLC, Express Truss LLC, William Keshishi, and Linet Mirzakanian, jointly and severally. This award is in addition to the statutory damages previously awarded by the Court at Doc. 29.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff’s counsel is reminded of his obligation to comply with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11 and that sanctions may result if counsel persists in seeking relief that is not permitted under the law.

///

1 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED directing** the Clerk of Court to enter judgment
2 accordingly and close this case.

3 Dated this 20th day of August, 2025.

4
5 
6 Stephen M. McNamee
7 Senior United States District Judge
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28